

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 11-14, 17-21, 24, 29 and 32-52 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement and/or the written description requirement. This contention is respectfully traversed.

The rejection objects to certain claims such as claims 1 and 37 which refer to the "bridge" and other similar language or similar subject matter. However, this is clearly disclosed in paragraph 27 of the application. Paragraph 27 refers to scintillator parts 202 which collectively form an array, and which are connected by "an exit window Bridge" spanning the gaps between the pixels 202. Paragraph 27, page 17 eighth line from the bottom, also refers to how these exit bridges may be formed of "scintillator material left uncut in the fabrication of the gaps". Note, however, no with disrespect to the Examiner's comments, the Examiner is correct that at least one disclosed embodiment requires that the exit window be removed. However, the intermediate product, that is the product that is intermediately formed when the scintillator array is put into

place and before that exit window is removed, is certainly disclosed.

For example, paragraph 28 explains how the pixels are inserted into the recess leaving the exit window bridge exposed.

Other places within the specification describe how that exit window Bridge holds that intermediate portion in place, see for example the mid-part of paragraph 27. Even if applicant is claiming the intermediate byproduct, it is still quite clear that the specification supports this intermediate product.

The rejection also objects to claim 44 as being inconsistent. With all due respect, the protrusion forms the air gap, and hence this claim is entirely consistent. However, to obviate any possible interpretation, the typographical error in claim 44 has been removed, and claim 44 has been clarified.

Only claims 9, 16, 22, 23, 25 and 26 were rejected based on prior art. Presumably, therefore, the remaining claims 1-7, 11-14, 17-21, 24, 29, and 32-52 should presumably be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claim 9 was rejected over Freund in view of DiBianca and Skillicorn. This contention is respectfully traversed. Claim 9 defines that the preformed reflector has inner surfaces that contain the scintillator material, and that a protrusion is formed as part of the inner surfaces of the preformed reflector

that form a spacer to form the air gap.

That is, the air gap is automatically formed from a specified structure of the preformed reflector.

The rejection states that DiBianca's system of using adhesive to produce an air gap, along with Skillcorn's alignment, makes obvious the claimed protrusion to form an air gap. However, this is respectfully suggested to be based on hindsight - not on the teaching of the combined references. In fact, neither DiBianca nor Skilllicorn teaches anything about the claimed protrusion. The DiBianca teaching would require the EXTRA STEP of adding adhesive. No prior art teaches the simple technique of simply using a protrusion for this purpose.

The rejection cites both DiBianca and Skilllicorn to show the air gaps. DiBianca teaches that an air gap may be useful in this kind of situation. Skilllicorn teaches aligning the placement of scintillator elements using stretched wires. These stretched wires are not disclosed to have the purpose of forming an air-gap.

Therefore, the hypothetical combination of DiBianca with Skilllicorn does not teach or suggest a protrusion formed of a spacer formed as part of the inner surfaces of the preformed reflector. DiBianca forms his air gap from adhesive material. This is entirely different from a reflector formed from a

protrusion on the preformed reflector that allows an air gap. DiBianca would hence require the extra step of depositing that adhesive material in place to form the air gap.

In fact, claim 9, which defines a protrusion forming a spacer to form the air gap, is much simpler than DiBianca's system of using the adhesive to form the air gap. In contrast to DiBianca's necessity to add the adhesive as a separate step, claim 9 simply allows forming a protrusion which automatically forms an air gap. This is not suggested by any of the cited prior art, and provides a significant simplicity as compared therewith - that simplicity not being fairly expected from any of that prior art.

Claim 16 was rejected over Freund in view of O'Kane and further in view of Hoffman. However, nothing in the cited prior art teaches a preformed reflector with different materials of the reflector formed of different materials. In fact, while Hoffman discloses that different scintillator materials could be used for different purposes, he teaches nothing about using different materials within pixels of a preformed reflector, as claimed.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this

response, (other than any paid concurrently via EFS), to Deposit
Account No. 50-4376, small entity.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/16/2008 _____ /Scott C Harris/ _____
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 74162
Law Office of Scott C. Harris
P.O. Box 1389
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
Telephone: (858) 756-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717